<u></u>			
Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/534,757	SWEAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley Edelman	2153	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appearable All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIOT the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this app or other appropriate communication IGHTS. This application is subject to	plication. If not include will be mailed in due	ed course. THIS
1. This communication is responsive to <u>Applicant's Appeal Brief filed on 3/31/05</u> .			
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are <u>2-48</u> .			
3. The drawings filed on 24 March 2000 are accepted by the Examiner.			
4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority until a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	been received. been received in Application No		tion from the
* Certified copies not received:			
Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONM THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.		complying with the rec	quirements
5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submit INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give			OTICE OF
6. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") mus	t be submitted.		
(a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached			
1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date			
(b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date			
Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1. each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the			back) of
7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT I			Note the
Attachment(s) 1. ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0	5. ☐ Notice of Informal P 6. ☐ Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Dat 8), 7. ☐ Examiner's Amendn	(PTO-413), e)-152)
Paper No./Mail Date 4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	8. ⊠ Examiner's Stateme 9. □ Other	ent of Reasons for Allo	

Notice of Allowability

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-37 (Rev. 1-04)

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to Applicant's Appeal Brief filed on March 31, 2005. Claims 2-45 are presented for further examination. Examiner has considered Applicant's arguments and agrees with some of Applicant's arguments. The claims are allowed for the reasons stated below.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's Appeal brief contains three main arguments:

- Doherty does not disclose or suggest an interactive Web site configured to display drawings and text files.
- 2. Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest project folders and standard folders wherein project related administration tasks are not available for standard folders.
- 3. Neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest the ability for a user on a website to have the ability to modify and organize project members, and for the user to define access permissions for such project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files.

In considering (1), Applicant contends that Doherty does not disclose or suggest an interactive Web site configured to display drawings and text files. It is noted that regardless of whether Doherty discloses such features (Examiner concedes that the reference is somewhat sparse in its explicit description of project-specific web sites),

such features are well known of project-specific websites as evidenced by the newly discovered AEC reference (A-E-C Automation Newsletter, July 1998, Vol. 22, Iss. 7 – see pp. 2-3). Therefore, the claims are not allowed because of those features.

In considering (2), Applicant contends that neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest project folders and standard folders wherein project related administration tasks are not available for standard folders. Examiner agrees with this argument.

In considering (3), Applicant contends that neither Doherty nor Glasser teach, disclose, or suggest the ability for a user on a website to have the ability to modify and organize project members, and for the user to define access permissions for such project members to access project folders, standard folders, drawings, and text files. Note again that the AEC reference discloses all of these limitations except for including the distinction between project folders and standard folders.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2-48 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

In considering independent claims 2, 16, and 31, the prior art of record does not disclose the claimed apparatus, method, and computer program product including an interactive web site that provides access to architectural project information, including

all of the limitations of the claim. The prior art of record specifically fails to disclose including project folders wherein project related administration tasks are available if a user is working with the project folders, and standard folders wherein project related administration tasks are not available when working with the standard folders, and further including defining access permissions for project members to access the project folders and the standard folders.

In other words, the claims specifically describe that projects include both the project folders and the standard folders and that project members have access to project folders to control administration tasks and standard folders (to presumably perform non-administration tasks). This is different from the cited Glasser reference, which describes "project" and "standard" folders, but does not describe that a particular project includes both a "project" and a "standard" folder.

In this manner, the claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art of record.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is 571-272-3953. The examiner can normally be reached from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

Application/Control Number: 09/534,757 Page 5

Art Unit: 2153

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached at 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RF

June 22, 2005

Bradley Polehnan